

**REMARKS**

Claims 3-19, 21-24 and 27-31 are pending in this application, of which claims 3-6, 9-11, 14, 16, 18-19, 24 and 27-31 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

Claims 22 and 23-34 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,396,157 to Hackett et al. (hereinafter "Hackett et al.").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Hackett et al. discloses a method and apparatus for improving vertical sharpness of picture tubes. Large format TV tubes must produce a high peak brightness in order to be acceptable to the user. This results in a large beam current in bright areas of the picture and in a subsequent defocusing of the resulting spot on the display and in a loss of the sharpness of vertical and horizontal transitions. The apparent sharpness of a vertical transition is gained by modifying the deflection of the TV receiver such that, at vertical transitions, the line on the bright side of the transition is deflected away from the transition region.

Column 2, lines 25-34 disclose:

An example of a vertical cross-section through an image is shown in FIG. 4. Each line and point represents the amplitude of the video signal at one pixel on each line 1-14 of the cross-section. It can be seen that in order to improve the display the scan on lines 3, 7, and 9 should be deflected in the direction indicated by the arrows. Transitions also exist at lines 11 and 13, but as this represents a high vertical frequency, no improvement can be made by modifying the scan, and so the lines should remain undeflected.

This differs from the present invention as follows:

1. No predetermined value for the luminance in a luminance change portion is shown in Fig. 4. Fig. 4 of Hackett et al. appears to show only two (2) values of luminance.
2. Hackett et al. prevents modification of vertical movement of the scanning lines when only a single horizontal line has high luminance (representing a “high vertical frequency”). In contrast, the present invention does not take this into account.
3. The limitation in the last paragraph of claim 22 of the instant application may be interpreted to mean that “the part of the scanning line thus moves depending on the amount of the change in the luminance and the level of the luminance”, as discussed on page 22, lines 3-5 of the specification. Hackett et al. fails to disclose this feature.
4. Hackett et al. fails to disclose the frequency domain emphasis circuit recited in claims 23-24 of the instant application.

Thus, the 35 USC §102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-4, 6-15, 18-19, 21 and 27-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Hackett et al. in view of Japanese Publication 06-284309 to Watanabe Junzo et al. (hereinafter “JP Pub ‘309”).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

JP Pub ‘309 has been cited for teaching:

1. bidirectional movement of the horizontal beam, as recited in claim 3;
2. the time axis reversion circuit recited in claim 4; and
3. the amplifier and gain control circuit recited in claims 6-8.

JP Pub '309, like Hackett et al. discussed above, fails to teach, mention or suggest the predetermined luminance value in a luminance change portion, as recited in claims 3, 9, 18, 21, 27, 30 and 31 of the instant application.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Hackett et al. in view of JP Pub '309.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, Hackett et al. and JP Pub '309 both fail to teach, mention or suggest the limitations of claim 3, from which claim 5 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over JP '309 in view of Hackett et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, in regard to claim 3, for instance, both of these cited references fail to teach, mention or suggest the predetermined luminance value recited in claim 16, from which claim 17 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 3-19, 21-24 and 27-31, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP

*Will Brooks*  
William L. Brooks  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla  
Atty. Docket No. **001557**  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE